

Docket No.: JP02 0010 US
PELT-27,779

PATENT

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated March 23, 2006. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are pending.

Regarding the § 102 Rejection

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being anticipated by *Fujimori et al.* (U.S. Published Application No. 2001/0008437).

Applicant has taken a close look at *Fujimori*, which teaches a liquid crystal display device. In Figure 1A, the light diffusion layer 30 is "formed on substantially the entire surface of the counter substrate 100B." See *Fujimori*, paragraph 59. As such, *Fujimori* only teaches providing a light diffusion layer that is in both the transmissive region and reflection region of each pixel. Furthermore, *Fujimori*, in Figure 1B, teaches placing a light diffusion layer 30 in the reflection region but not in the transmission region of each pixel. *Fujimori* does not teach or anticipate a transfective liquid crystal display device that has a transmissive region and a reflective region in each pixel and is constructed of a first and second substrate that face each other wherein the "first substrate comprises a reflecting member arranged in a first region other than the transmissive region, and said second substrate comprises a scattering member arranged only in at least part of the transmissive region."

Claim 1, as amended, recites, among other things, that its "first substrate comprises a reflecting member arranged in a first region other than the transmissive region, and said second substrate comprises a scattering member arranged only in at least part of the transmissive region." Since *Fujimori* does not teach or anticipate every element of Claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 1 is ready for allowance.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

4

SN: 10/510,589

Atty. Dkt. No. JP02 0010 US

PELT-27,779

Docket No.: JP02 0010 US
PELT-27,779

PATENT

Claim 5 recites a method of providing a transfective liquid crystal device. Claim 5 has been amended such that it recites, "arranging a scattering member in at least part of the transmissive region of said second substrate, but not in said first region." Claim 5 identifies the "first region" as a region that is other than the transmissive region. Again, Applicant respectfully points out that *Fujimori* does not teach or anticipate arranging a scattering member "in at least part of the transmissive region of said second substrate, but not in said first region" and therefore submits that *Fujimori* does not teach every element of Claim 5. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 5 is ready for allowance.

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being anticipated by *Narutaki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,538).

Narutaki, like *Fujimori*, teaches a scattering plate (on the surface of the polarizing plate 6 that faces the color filter substrate 2, see Column 33, lines 12-17 and Fig. 21) that covers both the reflective and transmissive regions of the substrate. *Narutaki* does not teach or anticipate a second substrate that "comprises a scattering member arranged only on at least part of the transmissive region." Furthermore, *Narutaki* does not teach or anticipate "arranging a scattering member in at least part of the transmission region of said second substrate, but not in said first region." As such, applicant respectfully submits, in similar fashion as discussed above with respect to *Fujimori*, that *Narutaki* does not teach or anticipate independent Claims 1 and 5 and respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 5 are ready for allowance.

Regarding the § 103 Rejection

Claims 3, 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being rendered obvious by *Fujimori et al.* in view of *Sekiguchi* (U.S. Publication 2002/0145688).

Applicant respectfully submits that although *Sekiguchi* may teach the use of a color filter having a scattering affect, *Sekiguchi* does not alleviate the deficiencies in the teaching of *Fujimori*. In particular, neither cited reference teaches, alludes to, or renders obvious separating the color filter wherein a first color filter has a scattering affect and is arranged in the transmissive region and a second color filter is arranged in a second region corresponding to said reflective region." Both *Fujimori* and *Sekiguchi* only teach a color filter or a color filter that has a scattering effect that would substantially cover both the transmissive and the reflective regions.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE 5
SN: 10/510,589
Atty. Dkt. No. JP02 0010 US
PELT-27,779

Docket No.: JP02 0010 US
PELT-27,779

PATENT

Applicant points out that there may be some confusion with respect to the word "corresponding" in the originally filed specification. Corresponding may mean that the two regions may correspond light to each other. It is also understood that corresponding means to suit or to match with an item. Thus, in Claim 3, the Applicant submits that the "second region" corresponds to or is the reflective region.

Regarding Claim 3, Claim 3 recites, among other things, that the "second substrate comprises a first color filter having a scattering affect arranged in the transmissive region and a second color filter arranged in a second region corresponding to said reflective region." Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Fujimori* or *Sekiguchi* teaches, alludes to, or renders obvious providing a first color filter having a scattering effect in the transmissive region and a second color filter arranged in a reflective region of a transmissive liquid crystal display's pixel. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 3 is ready for allowance.

Claim 4, being dependent on claim 3, is not anticipated for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 3. Furthermore, Claim 4 recites that the first color filter has a color different from that of said second color filter. Applicant respectfully submits that the use of dual color filters in the same pixel when one color of filter is used in the transmission region and another color of filter is used in the reflective region is not taught, alluded to, or rendered obvious by the cited art. Applicant respectfully request that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 4 is ready for allowance.

Claim 7 has been amended to make it clear that the step of arranging recites a first color filter having a scattering effect only in at least part of the transmissive region of the second substrate. As discussed above with respect to Claim 3, *Fujimori* in view of *Sekiguchi* does not teach or render obvious providing such a filter having a scattering effect only in "at least part of the transmissive region." As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 7 is ready for allowance.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

6

SN: 10/510,589

Atty. Dkt. No. JP02 0010 US

PELT-27,779

Docket No.: JP02 0010 US
PELT-27,779

PATENT

Claims 3, 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by *Narutaki* in view of *Sekiguchi*. Again, Applicant respectfully points out that neither of these cited references teach, allude to or render obvious either individually or in combination a transfective liquid crystal display device or method of providing a transfective liquid display device as recited in Claims 3, 4 and 7 and as discussed above. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn because none of the art teaches, alludes to or renders obvious a transfective liquid crystal display device wherein a color filter having a scattering effect is provided only in at least part of the transmissive region of the second substrate. Applicant respectfully requests the § 103 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claims 3, 4 and 7 are ready for allowance.

Regarding The Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiners indication that Claims 2 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PELT-27,779 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)



Steven R. Greenfield
Registration No. 38,166

SRG/dd

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

7

SN: 10/510,589
Atty. Dkt. No. JP02 0010 US
PELT-27,779